



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/988,241

11/19/2001

Toni Paila

004770.00026

8406

22908 7590 09/01/2010

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3000
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

TRINH, SONNY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/01/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9
10 *Ex parte* TONI PAILA, JANI PAIKELA, LIN XU,
11 JUHA-PEKKA LUOMA, and ROD WALSH
12

13
14 Appeal 2009-012730
15 Application 09/988,241
16 Technology Center 2600
17

18
19
20 Oral Hearing Held: July 21, 2010
21

22
23 Before JOHN C. MARTIN, JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO and
24 CARLA M. KRIVAK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
25

26
27 APPEARANCES:
28

29
30 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
31

32
33 ROSS A. DANNENBERG, ESQUIRE
34 Banner & Witcoff, LTD
35 1100 – 13th Street, N.W.
36 Suite 1200
37 Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
38 (202) 824-3153

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, July
2 21, 2010, commencing at 10:17 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
3 Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Paula Lowery,
4 Notary Public.

5 THE CLERK: Good morning. Calendar Number 31, Appeal No. 2009-
6 012730, Mr. Dannenberg.

7 JUDGE MARTIN: Good morning, Mr. Dannenberg.

8 MR. DANNENBERG: Good morning, Your Honors.

9 JUDGE MARTIN: You can proceed whenever you're ready.

10 Perhaps I should tell you right up front my problems with this case are
11 whether we should be looking at the provisional application at all, or
12 whether this argument about the 131 declaration is belated and not entitled
13 to consideration at this time.

14 MR. DANNENBERG: I actually did consider that, Your Honor, and would
15 like to point out in clarification that the evidence appendix we submitted
16 with our Reply Brief, it's not actually new evidence in this case. That
17 evidence appendix perhaps was mischaracterized as new evidence, but that
18 131 declaration was actually made in response to a previous office action
19 and has been in the record of this case.

20 So in response to one of the earlier office actions, the Examiner cited a
21 reference -- the name I forget -- in response to which we did file two 131
22 declarations. The second of which is the one that established our filing date
23 of August 20, 2001.

24 In response to that, the Examiner withdrew the rejections and made a new a
25 rejection to the claims in this case, apparently accepting the 131

1 declarations. So the claims have not changed since that 131 declaration was
2 filed. It's the same claims at issue.

3 JUDGE MARTIN: Let me interrupt a second to get the timeline straight. It
4 seems to me, if I've got the record correct, that the Examiner found the
5 second 131 declaration effective to overcome Chin. That determination was
6 made in an action mailed in June of '05.

7 We have a number of years go by where there's been rejections based on
8 Leung, and even in the Brief there was no reliance on the 131 declarations;
9 and now we see the argument in the Reply Brief that that same declaration
10 gets around the Leung printed patent application.

11 That's four years. So this kind of just slipped through the cracks, right?

12 MR. DANNENBERG: I understand, and maybe so that argument did; but at
13 the same time, we were under the understanding that when the Examiner
14 accepted that 131 declaration that that moves the effective filing date --
15 effective priority date, excuse me -- to August 20, 2001; and he would be
16 searching only for references that antedate that date.

17 JUDGE MARTIN: Right, but this point you're making now was just made
18 in the Reply Brief?

19 MR. DANNENBERG: That is correct.

20 JUDGE MARTIN: It's a new argument. The Examiner hasn't considered
21 the provisional Leung, right? To see whether it provides support for those
22 paragraphs that you had argued about? We don't know what the Examiner's
23 position is on that position, right?

24 MR. DANNENBERG: We don't know what the Examiner's position is on
25 that point, but we do know that the Examiner is aware of our priority date is

1 August 20, 2001, because it's the same Examiner that's considered the 131
2 declarations and found them effective to overcome Chin.

3 JUDGE MARTIN: In your Reply Brief you said the Examiner made a new
4 ground of rejection, and you thought that maybe -- is that the reason why
5 you think you can bring up this argument now?

6 MR. DANNENBERG: One of the bases. We're relying on new areas of the
7 reference.

8 Your Honor, to be honest, it slipped through the cracks that we didn't catch
9 the filing date; but I would ask that you also look at the fact that this case has
10 been pending nine years at this point.

11 We filed our Appeal almost four years ago, August 12th, I think, 2006. So
12 we're looking for some resolution on this case.

13 Yes, it will turn on whether that declaration is accepted or not, so if I may
14 proceed with some of the arguments, assuming that the declaration is
15 accepted. I understand your position that that is a critical issue.

16 JUDGE MARTIN: Before you proceed, is your argument that we should
17 look at the effect of the declaration now -- does that hinge on whether or not
18 the Examiner made a new ground of rejection in the answer?

19 MR. DANNENBERG: No, I don't believe it does.

20 JUDGE MARTIN: Okay.

21 MR. DANNENBERG: I believe the declaration was made of record early in
22 the prosecution of this case. It's just a fact in this case. That the effective
23 priority date is August 20, 2001.

24 The Examiner was aware of that by reviewing and accepting the declaration
25 back when he did, and even citing the Chin reference. He had to have seen

1 its filing date and had to have seen that it was supported by a provisional in
2 order to rely on it in the first place.

3 So he, himself, must have been aware that only whatever is provisional is
4 applicable in the Leung reference. That's our position on the declaration.

5 JUDGE MARTIN: All right.

6 MR. DANNENBERG: If I may proceed then?

7 JUDGE MARTIN: Sure.

8 MR. DANNENBERG: It sounds like you've read the history, but I'll
9 summarize the technology here.

10 We're talking about multicast session announcements in mobile
11 broadcasting. An example -- nonlimiting example -- would be if you have a
12 mobile phone that can receive radio or a mobile phone that can receive
13 television. Receiving a one-way multicast communication.

14 When the phone is communicating in the cell, it receives an overhead
15 announcement that says, okay, if you want to listen to channel 1, these are
16 your parameters. If you want to listen to channel 2, use these parameters.
17 So the invention here is when the cell or when the mobile device is in cell
18 number 1 it receives that overhead announcement, which includes
19 parameters not only for cell number 1, but also includes parameters for cell
20 number 2.

21 Back when this was filed, you know, our effective priority date, August,
22 2001, this was novel. Keep in mind we're dealing with a novelty rejection
23 not an obviousness rejection.

24 So the Leung provisional application that we're dealing with as the only
25 piece of prior art in front of us does not describe multicast session

1 information for neighboring cells. It only describes, at best, the identity of a
2 base station of a neighboring cell.

3 I should give credit, one of our summer associates came up with the
4 argument. It's akin to our application says, you know, we need you to drive
5 to Richmond and here is a map of how to get to Richmond. Whereas the
6 Leung provisional is equivalent to saying, here's a 7-11 where you can buy a
7 map. Go figure it out.

8 So the multicast session information is information sufficient to tune to the
9 broadcast channels in the cells, which is not disclosed in the Leung
10 provisional application.

11 In addition, I'd like to point out that while albeit we did not include them
12 under separate headers, we do maintain the position that we argued in
13 Claims 2, 9, and 34 separately. That we made additional arguments in the
14 Appeal Brief regarding the additional limitations in those claims.

15 So Claim 1 is definitely our broadest claim. You know, Leung does not
16 describe this multicast session information in multiple cells. Again, it only
17 describes the identity of a base station in a second cell.

18 So even if that were to be considered multicast session information, if you
19 look, for example, with respect to Claim 2, Claim 2 requires that the
20 multicast session information comprises a session identifier and a list of cells
21 in which the multicast session is available, which is the lone provisional.

22 We found no evidence of that.

23 For example, with respect to Claim 9, we further state that the multicast
24 session information comprises link level access parameters corresponding to
25 first cells and second cells. The identity of a base station is not link level
26 access

1 parameters -- parameters is plural. There are multiple parameters we are
2 dealing with.

3 Finally, with respect to Claim 34, another independent claim, we actually go
4 so far as to say the information that maps link level access parameters in
5 each of the plurality of cells to the multicast session.

6 So here it even requires mapping of link level access parameters to the
7 session with multiple cells.

8 So all these features, even if Leung is interpreted as the identity of a base
9 station being multicast session information, it still does not teach or suggest -
10 - even though this is an anticipation rejection -- it does not teach or suggest
11 that multicast session information comprises a session identifier and a list of
12 cells as in Claim 2. It does not map link level access parameters to each of a
13 plurality of cells to the multicast session as recited in Claim 34.

14 I skipped over Claim 9. The multicast session information does not describe
15 multicast session information comprising link level access parameters
16 corresponding to the first and second cells.

17 Those are the primary points I wanted to make here today. If you have
18 questions, I will gladly answer them.

19 JUDGE MARTIN: Questions?

20 JUDGE RUGGIERO: No questions.

21 JUDGE KRIVAK: No.

22 JUDGE MARTIN: No further questions, thank you.

23 Whereupon, the proceedings at 10:27 a.m. were concluded.

24

25